

SUMMARY NOTES

ABAG Executive Board
Thursday, October 20, 2016
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Board Room
San Francisco, California

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Julie Pierce, Councilmember, City of Clayton, noted that there was not a quorum of the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments present at about 7:04 p.m. The President asked that the ABAG staff proceed with their presentation without a quorum present.

President Pierce led the Executive Board and the public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The following members of the Executive Board were present for part, or all, of the time noted.

Representatives and Alternates Present

Supervisor Candace Andersen
Supervisor Damon Connolly
Councilmember Jim Davis
Mayor Pat Eklund
Vice Mayor Pradeep Gupta
Councilmember Dave Hudson
Mayor Wayne Lee
Supervisor Mark Luce
Vice Mayor Jake Mackenzie
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Karen Mitchoff
Councilmember Raul Peralez
Councilmember Julie Pierce
Supervisor David Rabbitt
Vice Mayor Greg Scharff
Mayor Trish Spencer

Jurisdiction

County of Contra Costa
County of Marin
City of Sunnyvale
City of Novato
City of South San Francisco
City of San Ramon
City of Milbrae
County of Napa
City of Rohnert Park
County of San Francisco
Count of Contra Costa
City of San Jose
City of Clayton
County of Sonoma
City of Palo Alto
City of Alameda

Representatives Absent

Mayor Jack Batchelor
Councilmember Annie Campbell Washington
Supervisor Cindy Chavez
Supervisor David Cortese
Dir Nicole Elliott, Leg and Gov Affairs
Mayor Leon Garcia
Councilmember Abel Guillen
Supervisor Scott Haggerty
Mayor Bill Harrison
Councilmember Charles "Chappie" Jones
Supervisor Jane Kim
Director William Kissinger *

Jurisdiction

City of Dixon
City of Oakland
County of Santa Clara
County of Santa Clara
City of San Francisco
City of American Canyon
City of Oakland
County of Alameda
City of Fremont
City of San Jose
County of San Francisco
RWQCB

Mayor Edwin Lee	City of San Francisco
Councilmember Lynette Gibson McElhaney	City of Oakland
Supervisor Nathan Miley	County of Alameda
Supervisor Dave Pine	County of San Mateo
Supervisor Linda Seifert	County of Solano
Supervisor Warren Slocum	County of San Mateo

[* Non-voting Advisory Member]

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Karen Mitchoff, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, and Chair, Resiliency Subcommittee, announced the Bay Area Confluence Conference on November 10, 2016.

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Pierce announced a special General Assembly on Thursday, January 19, 2017. The agenda will include a report on the ABAG MTC Option 7 Implementation Plan and a report on the Plan Bay Area 2040 Preferred Scenario. The regular General Assembly will be in April 2017.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Update on the ABAG/MTC Option 7 Implementation Action Plan

Brad Paul, ABAG Deputy Executive Director, reported on the ABAG/MTC Option 7 Implementation Action Plan, including work involving Public Finance Management, Inc. on the financial due diligence, and Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, on the legal due diligence; the contract for services and memorandum of understanding; employee relations committee; Koff and Associates on the staff consolidation; and organizational development and staff integration.

Members discussed consultant costs and reviewing the draft contract for services and draft memorandum of understanding.

[The ABAG staff presented Item 8 next.]

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

There was no presentation of, or action taken on, the Consent Calendar.

A. Authorize Conveyance of Interest in Real Property to the City of San Ramon

7. REPORT ON ABAG/STARS 457 DEFERRED COMPENSATION PROGRAM

There was no presentation of, or action taken on, the ABAG/STARS 457 Deferred Compensation Program.

8. REPORT ON LOCAL COLLABORATION PROGRAMS—ENTERPRISES AND SERVICE PROGRAMS

Staff presented an overview and highlights of ABAG's local collaboration programs. The presentation of ABAG's enterprises and service programs is intended to extend over the next Executive Board meetings.

A. Presentation on San Francisco Estuary Partnership

Caitlin Sweeney, Director, San Francisco Estuary Partnership, presented the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, including the National Estuary Program under the Clean Water Act; coalition of resource agencies, non-profit organizations, and scientists; operating budget and project and program funding; facilitate partnerships; collaborate on health of the Estuary and land use, resilience, and regional planning; 2016 Estuary Blueprint; and importance of the Estuary.

Nancy Woo, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, and Andrew Gunther, Executive Coordinator, Bay Area Ecosystems Climate Change Consortium.

Members discussed preserving the Bay; the San Francisco Bay watershed; active projects in San Francisco and East and West peninsula; San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board; the North Bay Climate Adaptation Initiative; the North Bay Watershed Group; green streets; Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan; storm water treatment; Delta Counties Coalition; storm water management; sea level rise.

9. REPORT ON PLAN BAY AREA 2040—DRAFT PREFERRED SCENARIO COMMENTS

Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, reported on the Plan Bay Area 2040 Preferred Scenario, including preferred scenario adoption; implementation action guidance, and approach to the next Plan Bay Area. She reported on Priority Development Areas; transportation investments; performance targets; draft implementation actions on economic development, housing, resilience, and Priority Development Areas.

The following individuals gave public comment: Matt Vander Sluis, Greenbelt Alliance; Peter Galvao, Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California.

Members discussed economic sustainability.

Ken Kirkey, MTC Planning Director, reported on the use of Urban Sims and regional land use planning.

Chion announced an Urban Sims informational workshop on November 3, 2016.

Members discussed an economic reality test of goals and projection; developing policy and implementation actions; an economic development strategy; considering individuals and stakeholders; means comparison; water availability; fiscal sustainability; Environmental Impact Review alternatives; greenhouse gas reductions and jobs close to housing; consequences of not approving the Preferred Scenario.

Kirkey reported on the Regional Transportation Plan, transportation and housing, and policy discussions.

Members discussed SB 375; the next Plan Bay Area and Regional Housing Needs Assessment; General Plan policies, Urban Sims, and limited focused update; local land use control and long term growth; Priority Conservation Areas and Priority Development Areas; open space and agricultural lands; preserving urban growth boundaries; technology and transportation; future mobility research; Priority Production Areas; work force zoning and work force priority housing; jobs and housing balance; Sustainable Communities Strategy scoping plan and AB 32.

[Begin Transcript Executive Board Meeting 10/20/16 on Plan Bay Area]

Julie Pierce: Thank you to our guests, this is wonderful, good information and we will talk more about a possible delegations trip to Sacramento, do a little collaboration there. Next item on the agenda is a report on the Plan Bay Area 2040. The draft preferred scenario and the comments we received by the deadline of the fourteenth. Miriam is going to go into that and some of the potential implementation and what our process is going forward. Ken is there too.

Miriam Chion: Yes. Good evening board meeting members. This is your last executive board meeting to discuss the draft preferred scenario for Plan Bay Area. In November you will join the MTC planning committee as well as the full commission to discuss the approval of the final preferred scenario.

This is a meeting for you to discuss your expectations about this plan update, to give us some guidance on the implementation actions for completion by Spring 2017 and to give us your thoughts on how to approach the next Plan Bay Area. We have prepared this plan because there is a state legislation, SB375, Sustainable Community Strategies, requires to do this.

This legislation comes to support the work that our local planners, our planning directors, our city councils have been doing for several years. It is important to remind ourselves that before the legislation was enacted, you had already designated priority development areas but it's even more important to remind ourselves that before the creation of the priority development areas, we had a lot of local plans that started addressing some of the challenges, some of the different lifestyles, some of the issues that were being presented on the ground.

We have the downtown planning in Petaluma, we have West Oakland. We had the Eastern neighborhoods in San Francisco. We have the San Jose general plan. We have a number of local efforts that have started addressing those issues. This plan comes here to help us connect those dots on the ground and to give traction to regional efforts in addressing our housing affordability, access to job, environmental challenges and mobility.

I'll just provide a short overview, the whole purpose of this session was to give you time to discuss the plan so Ken and I then will be happy to address any comments and questions that you might have. On the preferred scenario, we have presented to you the growth pattern allocation, the transportation investments, the performance targets. There is a packet, there's a link on your memo, but there is also a hard copy packet that includes all the letters and comments that we have received. More than thirty jurisdictions submitted very detailed and substantial comments, many of you included.

We receive input from more than forty organization and again, with a lot of depth in their statements. We have received a very diverse set of

comments. We won't go into the details, you have the letters in front of you. Let me just flag a few things. There's a lot of concern about the cost of housing and housing affordability as reflected in some of our performance targets. There are concerns from many jurisdictions about scale of housing or the scale of jobs and the location of that future growth. There are concerns about access to those jobs and middle-wage jobs. There are concerns about what are going to be the implementation actions to help us carry some of those expectations.

Actually, at the last joint ABAG-MTC committee meeting there were a lot of points raised, and there were a lot of emphasis about identifying what are the implementations that will give our plan more traction on the ground.

You have a link and you have received those documents, the outline of some of the implementation actions that we have discussed with the ABAG Executive Board, with the Regional Planning Committee, and many components with MTC.

On the economic development you had full presentation. Pradeep Gupta, chair of the subcommittee, has been carrying a lot of leadership in this effort. There's one specific point that I just want to mention here.

The Regional Planning Committee has a recommendation on priority production areas. Because the time is limited today, in November we have the discussion of the final scenario. We'll bring that to you in January. That will also give us more time to coordinate a report with MTC.

In terms of housing, you are familiar with some of the efforts. This issue of housing affordability is definitely not new to the Bay Area, but as we assess some of the information, the scale of overcrowding, of homelessness and displacement, is way beyond anything we have seen.

There is a lot of attention that will be required for short-term strategies as well as longer term efforts that will require a lot of involvement on the ground.

On resilience, again you had a full presentation at the last meeting. Supervisor Mitchoff shared with us one of the tasks of the implementation work, and she's actually the chair of the Infrastructure Subcommittee, and might provide you with more detail as needed.

Finally, the Priority Development Areas is the framework of a lot of what we do. We've been working on these efforts for a while. We have the MTC funded PDA planning grants, we have efforts on the corridors, the Grand Boulevard Initiative, the East Bay Corridor, and there are more efforts coming up on CEQA streamlining or project entitlement, as well as how to pay attention to the quality of the place, to the culture, character, and history of our communities, which is essential in these efforts.

It's not just about numbers, it's not just about specific housing units, it's about what our people are choosing and what are their visions for those communities.

This Plan is updated every four years, yet the purpose of our Plan is to come together as a collective to figure out how we can improve the quality of life for our communities today and tomorrow, to find better access to housing and jobs.

With each update we learn a little bit and we try to make things a little bit better. We feel very strongly that the public engagement was substantially improved in this Plan. We also feel that we were able to discuss more specifically what was happening in Priority Development Areas and, what were some of the complexities of the Priority Conservation Areas.

Each cycle has a slightly different character. The first one that you approved came together with the Regional Housing Need Allocation, which gives it a different level of complexity. We also pay a lot more attention to local aspirations.

For this one, which we continue to call a limited update, we use a land use model that focuses a lot on the economic trends. As we move forward into the next Plan Bay Area, as we start closing this one it is important for us to hear what is the approach that you think needs to be taken for the next Plan Bay Area? What are the elements that you think are essential as we start thinking about the next Plan?

It will be important for us to understand as the Council of Governments, how do you see your role shaping the next Plan Bay Area. To quote Henry Gardner, "ABAG has no big money, has not a lot of regulatory power, but the power of our agency resides on the collective. It's our ability to come together, to put together better proposals, stronger proposals, to address our regional challenges."

We would appreciate your input on those three areas, the preferred scenario, the implementation actions, and the approach for the next Plan. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: I think I'm going to go to public comment first, and that way we can hear from our speakers. I would go first to Matt Vander Sluis, to be followed by Pedro Galvao.

Matt Vander Sluis: Matt Van Der Slice with Greenbelt Alliance, a pleasure to be with you this evening. I should be on, there we are. Thank you. A few quick comments for you this evening. I wanted to draw your attention to some of the letters that you've received. We helped coordinate a letter from 17 different organizations and agencies including Greenbelt Alliance, the Coastal Conservancy, Rails to Trails Conservancy, Transform, the Nature Conservancy, and many others.

Highlighting several elements of the Draft Preferred Scenario that's currently under discussion this evening. One is that we are glad that the Plan keeps growth within existing urban growth boundaries. Two, we are flagging that there are some areas that more growth is heading to outlying areas. Places like Rio Vista, Brentwood, Gilroy, in this draft, compared to the previous Plan Bay Area, and we hope that some of that growth could be reallocated to places close to jobs and transit.

Third, that we would like to see stronger strategies included in the Plan to address the social equity outcomes so that we do better on these targets, particularly on housing affordability.

Fourth, calling for a strong set of implementation actions, particularly having a conservation agenda in this Plan, for what we should be doing as a region in the coming years to make the open space target achieved.

We also, at Greenbelt Alliance, consulted with Calthorpe Analytics to do an assessment of what's in the Draft Preferred Scenario, and found some really interesting things that align with what we were hearing about from the San Francisco Estuary Partnership earlier this evening.

If we pursue the more focused footprint in the Draft Preferred Scenario compared to business as usual, you would have about half as much development on natural and agricultural lands, saving about 18,000 acres of those important lands around the region.

The benefits that we would accrue in the Bay Area are pretty tremendous. You've got, in your packets, some of these charts from this Calthorpe Analytics. We would save, by protecting watershed lands from sprawl development, we would save the equivalent of about 66,000 families' water supply yearly.

We would also save enough Carbon for about 100,000 automobiles per year, simply by allowing the natural lands to sequester Carbon, as well as protection of natural habitat and protecting about 2,500 acres of important crop lands that produce about \$9 million a year in fresh fruits and vegetables.

We could do even better. We analyzed one of the more compact scenarios from this summer and found that we could reduce that amount of sprawl development by an additional 15% if we choose to have a slightly more compact footprint.

With that, as we think about these implementation actions we would strongly encourage you to come up with a really robust set of implementation actions around housing affordability, around transit, around open space. We would love to see open space be included as one of the key implementation categories.

We saw four categories this evening; it would be great to see one on open space. Thanks so much.

Julie Pierce: Thank you, Matt. Next speaker is Pedro Galvao. Any other speakers want to speak under this item? Okay. Pedro.

Pedro Galvao: Good evening, ABAG Board members. My name is Pedro Galvao and I'm with the Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak this evening, and also thank you for having this additional meeting to really dig into the details of the Plan. This was one of our original asks and I'm really glad that you guys are having this conversation.

I'd like to begin by saying that in the Draft Preferred, it gives us a vision of the Bay Area that I don't think any of us really want to live in. It paints a picture where 50% of the population will be paying up to 70% of their income in housing and transportation costs. We owe it to the residents of the Bay Area to do better than that. We really need to plan for the region that we want, not for the region that UrbanSim shows us going towards. So, with that said, I would like to urge you to really push for a thoughtful and robust implementation plan for this iteration for Plan Bay Area 2017. By that I mean specifically it should include. It should quantify both the funding gap that we need to fill in to meet our housing affordability needs, as well as the policy gaps that we also need to address to get us to build the affordable housing that we need to scale to keep our communities whole and prevent economic displacement.

The implementation plan should also establish a road map of short-term, medium-term, and long-term actions that we can take to, again, address our affordability crisis, keep our communities whole. That will include some things that we can do next year, some things that we can do in five years from now, but this plan needs to be robust.

Also, we would like you to commit, both staffs from ABAG and MTC, to creating a work program for the housing actions to be adopted concurrently with the final EIR by next summer. What that will mean is that staff will have specific assignments given to them that they will follow through. In the last Plan, we had a plan to build on and that chapter detailed actions that could be taken by the agencies, and to ABAG and MTC's credit, there have been a lot of actions that were taken but a lot that were left by the wayside. We would like to see a commitment to actually carrying out the actions spelled out in this implementation plan, even if it's not immediate.

Just as importantly, I would really like to urge you to not limit the actions that we can take or the growth allocations that we make to necessarily what can be modeled by UrbanSim right now. UrbanSim is a really great tool. It's a powerful tool that shows us if we make certain policy decisions where is growth going to be. Like any tool, it needs improvement. Some of the issues that UrbanSim doesn't address, for example, is housing growth appropriately distributed. Some jurisdictions, like Palo Alto, UrbanSim assigns less housing growth than Palo Alto calls for in its own general plan. In other jurisdictions like Livermore, San Carlos, and Los Gatos, UrbanSim assigns less housing growth than called for the eight-year RHNA.

UrbanSim also makes assumptions around inclusionary housing that are inconsistent with state law. All of these things need to be improved before we can say that this is the Plan. It's making the need for robust implementation plan all that more necessary, so please, I urge you to not limit your imagination to what can be modeled, and to really take the actions that we need to take to not exacerbate our region's housing affordability crisis or displacement crisis, and our jobs/housing imbalance. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Thank you, Pedro.

All right, I'm going to bring it back up here. It looks like I have a stack of cards on this side and everybody's still pondering on this side, so we'll give you time. We're going to start down here with Wayne and work our way around.

Wayne Lee:

Thank you. I'd like to see if we emphasize more on ... I don't know how to describe it. I guess economic sustainability or livable sustainability, because my vision is that for some towns that are revenue-challenged, let's say, they build ... I think we all want housing because we recognize the fact that there is a crisis in housing and the only answer and solution is to build more housing. Millbrae is definitely wanting to build more housing, but we also recognize by building more housing we provide a deficit of expenses that incurs because of that. Property taxes does not bring in the revenues that we need to sustain our city, especially if we're talking about additional 4,000 people in Millbrae. Anyways, it's going to be quite a bit more, and we don't have ... A lot of the cities on the peninsulas don't have any more room for manufacturing, or they don't have the luxury of having more tax-paying abilities. What we need is to have, make sure that up front and very highlighted as one of the top priorities, is the sustainability which includes the economic basis for sustaining that community that we're trying to build.

Because we're going to add all this extra housing, we need to be able to ... It's like a balloon, like a water balloon. If you imagine you squeeze one side and the other side gets bigger, so you're just shifting the problem from one side to the other. Your cost is going to still ... You're going to drive out the people who can't afford to pay the taxes to maintain the additional people. Now you're going to make those people homeless because they can't afford to pay the taxes, because you got to pay for fire, police, you got to pay for roads, and we all face that, right? We know the money has to come from somewhere and if it's not coming from property taxes, where is it coming from?

I would like to, I would like ... I strongly, strongly like to see ... I know that Commissioner Gupta? here is working on that commission, and I think that he's been doing a fabulous job... But we really like to see that as emphasis, and that we're looking at that. We're not just saying "Housing, housing, transportation, and jobs," because the jobs doesn't mean anything if they're not spending money in the town that needs the money. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Thank you, Wayne.

I'm going to ask Ken if you would just give us a quick overview of what UrbanSim is intended to do in this Plan versus the way we've always done it before, and kind of explain the economic and reality touchstone that we're trying to accomplish here, versus the aspirational plan.

Ken Kirkey:

Sure. I'll give it a shot and then you can tell me what I've missed.

Julie Pierce:

Okay.

Ken Kirkey: UrbanSim is a regional land use model. We're using it comprehensively for the first time with this Plan. We didn't use it for anything really other than the EIR the last time around for the first Plan that was adopted. It has as its basis all the general plans in the region. It's a parcel-based model. It is not a machine that sits in the corner; it's about the inputs that it receives relative to those bases that it utilizes. It looks at the forecast total that is input, so the forecast that was developed by the forecasting group at ABAG, and where that might be distributed based upon a number of policy inputs, based upon local zoning, based upon a number of factors. It is, in some respects, different than purely a vision for how the region is going to grow.

For example, there are places that are transit-served in fill neighborhoods in the East Bay on BART lines at BART stations. Those communities would like to see substantial in fill development now. They haven't seen much of that, even in this boom, in part because we don't have tax increment financing. There could be a decision to say, "We assume that redevelopment is coming back. We assume something better than redevelopment is coming back," and that would input where growth would go in this distribution pattern.

For the draft-preferred scenario, we have tried to take an approach that is pretty conservative in terms of looking at local zoning, looking at pretty modest policy inputs, and saying this is what the distribution looks like. Relative to Pedro's comments before, we're not presenting the draft-preferred scenario as necessarily where the region needs to be or where it should be heading. We are saying this is where it is headed based upon fairly modest policy assumptions that we have right now. We think there is a need to do much more. There is much more that needs to be done in terms of policy inputs that influence development and support housing growth relative to economic sustainability. There are arguably a lot of impediments that need to be removed, that make it more difficult to build in certain locations, but those changes, as much as they have been talked about, they have not been advanced to any great degree.

To your comments, President Pierce, or your question, I think we're in part trying to say, "This is the world as it looks right now going forward." It is a bit of a reality check. I'm sure you wish you did, but you don't have to deal with RHNA] this time around. This is a chance to step back and look at some of these issues and really build toward the not limited and not, well still hopefully focused, but not minor update in four years.

Miriam Chion: Julie, I would like to mention that there are a few of you that have requested some kind of information session on UrbanSim. There's a workshop that Paul Waddell, the designer of this model, is hosting here in this building, November 3rd. While the workshop is primarily for modelers and planners, he's willing to accommodate a slot for elected officials, if there was the desire.

Julie Pierce: I think several of us would like to be able to attend that, so if you would email that out to all of the Executive Board members to give us an idea. I

would suspect that there are some of the MTC commissioners that would be interested as well.

The only thing I would add to that and I framed it this way at our joint meeting last Friday is that as I understand how UrbanSim is working and what we need to do to make this work. UrbanSim is giving us an economic reality test of our aspirational goals from the 2013 Plan and from the inputs that we put into it with our projections that ABAG did on what our total housing need is for the next Plan.

What UrbanSim has done is tell us how likely is development to happen in certain places. Is it going to go where we really think we want it to go or is it going to go where it's always wanted to go? What are the hurdles we have to identify that we need to remove to get it to go where we want it to go?

This is our opportunity to look at those policy levers that we may need to include in the next plan as implementation actions that we could each in our own jurisdictions embrace in order to try to accomplish what our own individual goals are to achieve the future that we each need.

I think it identifies where some potential changes might be to our local policies that would inspire that change. I think it also, to some extent, identifies what the hurdles are. I think that's really important. It also tells us that we probably can't do anywhere close to what we really want to do unless we make some pretty dramatic changes.

One of the things that was brought up at the joint meeting is, what is the real number we need to move the needle? Is it the 820,000 units that we're projecting based on our projections? Is that really going to move the needle or is that going to keep us status quo? We see that the affordability index is projected to be pretty dramatic. It's pretty draconian.

If we really wanted to make things improve by 2040, what would we have to do on a sustained basis? How much would it cost? What would the resources be that would be required to change this?

I think this is our opportunity to give some feedback and some policy discussion about some of those things. We had a very robust discussion on Friday with the joint committee with a lot of good ideas and a lot of hard questions being asked. What we directed at that point was that we come back with some really strong policy discussions after the first of the year to start talking about what real implementation actions we can come up with that could be included.

We really want to hear from you the things that you find as challenges, the places where you think this may fall short, understanding that this is to be a reality test and identify the shortcomings of where we were headed before and what we might do in the future.

If there are challenges you see, we need to see those. Any ideas you have to solve this crisis would be greatly welcomed. With that, I'm going to go ahead and go to Pradeep, and then on around the circle.

Pradeep Gupta:

Thank you, President Pierce. Just three quick points. One, yes, I agree fully that the last time we met in the joint meeting with the MTC Planning Committee, we had a robust discussion. I don't want to repeat all the comments that were made, but they were very insightful comments, as well as very productive comments.

One of the things that I just wanted to do in my comment today was to highlight the area that the planning director, Miriam, pointed out, namely, the economic development strategy of the Regional Planning Committee and the subcommittee, Economic Development Strategy Committee are very excited about what these efforts could bring about. We are thinking about concepts like economic development or priority production areas, but I don't think that we'll be able to do that kind of work with the Plan Bay Area at 2040 for this time, but it will lead a foundation thinking for us to include that in our next iteration of the Plan Bay.

Number two, many of the issues that we are talking about today, about equity, displacement, preservation of small industries, matching housing and employment areas, are going to be part of that study that we are looking at and also as a vehicle of putting all these ideas together. It's not new things. Many of these studies have been done already by ABAG in terms of various individual pieces to think of that issue.

With the vehicle of economic development administrations, region-wide economic development district that we are thinking about, the Regional Planning Committee is fully supportive of looking at the issue of putting this whole area as one of the economic district in order to make sure that we get all the federal assistance we can get, both in terms of knowledge, as well as any resources.

To me, a bigger benefit of that study is that it provides a systematic framework in which we'll be able to put many previous studies into the context in one singularly unified approach to the economic strategy because it does require what we call SWOT analysis, which forces you to think step-by-step about your situation, what are the threats, what are the opportunities, and what should be the policies. With that kind of structure that is required, in order to get us into that arena, I think we are moving the right direction.

In terms of our current plan, I fully agree with President Pierce that we are looking at this as more like an economic reality check. Our region is facing extremely uncommon economic forces right now. I would have been surprised if we were able to recreate that economic development by any model in the world, whether it's UrbanSim or any other model.

I think we are learning a little bit as we go further along. I'm optimistic that with the knowledge we gain from this situation, we'll be able to do Plan Bay Area's future additions with much more comprehension.

Let me assure that by the time we come to Plan Bay Area next plan, there will be more issues coming in front of us, and we might be building up on those issues, but let's face it. The planning is a process that is repeated.

Every time we make a plan, we tell ourselves and everybody else, "It's the best plan that was ever done," but we know in our hearts that after 40 years, we want to revisit that.

Keep that in mind. Don't think of every plan as answering all the questions, but raising some good questions. Thank you.

Julie Pierce:

Thanks, Pradeep. Pat?

Pat Eklund:

Thank you very much, President Pierce. First of all, great job so far. I sent some personal comments.

I hope that in the future, individuals are considered also as stakeholders. I don't know what the distinction is there, but the fact that there were only two "individual" comments leads me to be a little bit more concerned about the lack of public engagement on the preferred scenario. I'm hoping that we can start talking about maybe some public workshops, at least in Marin, about the preferred scenario the first part of the year. Maybe Miriam or Ken, we could have a conversation about that a little bit later. We didn't really get very many people from the "public" commenting on this yet.

My concerns are multiple. First is, in my opinion, the 2010 base year should not have changed from 2013. I still don't understand why. I understand that you're using the census whereas 2010 or 2013, I don't know what system we used. But to me, to be able to compare apples and oranges, you really need to start out with the number that was approved in 2013 as the base year. Then if you want to make any changes to update it, then call it 2015 reality check or something like that, just so that there's a means of comparison. Because it's very confusing to people and especially as I went through the comments that were sent in by cities. Virtually, probably 90% of those, maybe even 95% of those, including the 2 county comments, really questioned the numbers and felt that there weren't enough jobs or there was too much housing or not enough housing and too much jobs. The balance just really wasn't as reflected in their general plans.

I'm going to learn hopefully more about Urban Sim, but I think that just having an economic model is not necessarily how you plan. I think the whole idea is just for us to really achieve SB 375 which is what do we need to do in order to reduce greenhouse gas reductions which is not necessarily an economic model. It's really trying to increase the air quality.

That base year is really disconcerting ...

Ken Kirkey:

If I may just clarify the base here. I mentioned this at the joint meeting last Friday. The base year has 2 components, housing and employment. In terms of housing, what happened with this update was that the way it was factored up from census block group levels, there was a bit of overlap of jurisdictions that didn't align perfectly. It would have made, arguably, more sense to just go with the base numbers we used last time for households,

so that's what we're going to do going forward. So that confusion should go away.

As for employment, the way employment is being forecasted with this update is different. That's based upon what the forecasting group at ABAG has come up with. From our perspective, it's a better approach. It's more detailed. It gets into better definitions of employment classifications and so forth. It's simply a different way to come at the employment numbers and that's why the base for employment has changed somewhat for jurisdictions.

Pat Eklund: Maybe we can have more conversation offline about that because I still am struggling with, this is a 30 year, well 2040 ... So, we can have some more discussion offline on that.

The UrbanSim numbers, I looked at San Jose's letter, a lot of different cities ... Oh, that's okay. Did you want to say something, Miriam? No? The numbers, how are you going to adjust this in UrbanSim?

Ken Kirkey: You're referring to ... the feedback from jurisdictions?

Pat Eklund: From all the 33 cities, or 90% of them, that said that the numbers did not reflect what their general plan said.

Ken Kirkey: We've had meetings with planning directors in every county. We've had individual staff to staff meetings with 21 of the cities. Staff has been working on the input that was received from the jurisdictions, looking at UrbanSim, looking at inputs and looking at outputs and adjusting that. When we bring the final preferred scenario to you all in the MTC Commission on November 17th, there will be changes from the draft preferred scenario.

There won't necessarily be 1 for 1, exactly what a given city said because it's a zero sum game and this is a regional plan, but there will be pretty substantial changes that were based upon dialog with the local cities and counties.

Pat Eklund: I know some cities were concerned about expressing concerns about the numbers because they were under the understanding that the numbers were then only going to be adjusted within that county, where I was told that the numbers were still at the regional level.

Ken Kirkey: That's correct.

Pat Eklund: Okay. So I need to go back to those cities in Marin. Somebody from MTC said that no, the numbers would be adjusted within the county so that's why some of the cities did not make comments, including the City of Novato, San Rafael, and some others. I'll go back and I'll correct that. It will be interesting to see how the numbers come up.

In terms of what is not in this plan so far, because I have concerns about the assumptions. I'm sure we're going to get answers to all those questions, but ... We talked about water availability in 2013, that that's

something that we were going to be looking at as part of this update. Is there going to be any section in water availability?

Miriam Chion: We won't have a detailed analysis, but as part of the infrastructure subcommittee, there has been substantial dialog between the water districts and our local planners. What we're hoping to include is a discussion of several of the overarching challenges given the growth that is proposed for the region. At the regional level, you will have an assessment of key challenges and key strategies.

Pat Eklund: So there will be something in there so that we can build on it for the next one? Great.

The other issue that I raised at the, I think it was at the joint meeting, was the fiscal sustainability for cities and counties to actually help pay for the services for all those people that are going to be living here and working here in the future. I know, I think at the last meeting, we talked about, well, we have to modify Prop 13. I think that's one of the comments that was made. I think that's an issue that needs to be highlighted. Not necessarily solved or even ideas for that, but just recognizing the fact that a lot of us are struggling to pay for those services. What we're doing is we're doing Mello-Rooses. We're doing CFDs, which is just adding to the burden of the new folks that are coming in and paying a disproportionate share. That's an issue I think that somehow we're going to have to get our arms around that. I'm not sure how.

Ken Kirkey: That's a common theme that has come up in a lot of the discussions we've heard. A lot of the discussions have been on the policy level. They've been about how can things be changed and what are some of the impediments, such as you just described, to doing so. I think the short answer is that there is not a short answer. I mean this region has been building or not building, toward this for 3 decades. It's going to take a lot of work and a lot of thoughtful discussion and a lot of partnerships and other things to even have a good discussion about how these things could change. We're hearing a lot of what you just described.

Pat Eklund: Yeah. I know Novato and a lot of cities in Marin are hurting. The last question I had is that on the 17th are we going to get an idea of what kind of alternatives are going to be looked at in the EIR?

Ken Kirkey: The current path is that for November 17th, the final preferred scenario will be presented and recommended for adoption. We'll come back in December with recommendations really to the EIR and alternatives. In part because the final preferred scenario should really be adopted so the EIR consultants can do more analysis on it and can also do initial analysis on the alternatives that were presented to us for consideration from various entities. Then we can come forward in December and make a recommendation.

Pat Eklund: That's great. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Okay, if we all take this long, we will not get out of here in a reasonable time tonight. So I'm going to ask you to be succinct as we go forward.

Trish, welcome. Glad to have you here tonight. I think this is your first meeting here in this building?

Trish Spencer: This is my first meeting here in this building.

Julie Pierce: Welcome to the Metro Center.

Trish Spencer: I apologize for being late. I actually had to walk quite a distance. Thank you and I want to actually thank all of you for your work on this. I do apologize if my comments are ... however you interpret them. When I read this plan and I appreciate the comments from the public.

Greenhouse gas reduction, I see that as a very important issue and when I hear about that, what I think is that we need to have jobs closer to where we're living. When I read this plan and I see what other cities have commented and what the city of Alameda's comments are, we're actually being asked to put housing where we're trying to put jobs. If we're putting housing where we're trying to put jobs, then that exacerbates our problem. Our residents have to commute farther. That is the complete opposite of what I think the goal is. So when I sit as mayor of the city of Alameda, and I think these other mayors do the same thing, we take it very seriously, the charge to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. When I look at this plan, many of these comments, it is the opposite. If we do not have the jobs where we live, we will continue to have transportation issues. We're going to have to make huge investments in transportation that we do not have the money in this state. We do not have, for instance, in Alameda a BART station. We are dependent upon AC Transit to get to BART. That is multiple public transportation, which we know in fact reduces the use of public transportation and increases the use of single occupancy vehicles.

We don't have money for a BART station in Alameda. Rather than going to BART and saying I need you to put, I know that's not going to happen. It's unrealistic. What we're trying to do is create jobs close to us, but when I look at the plan, not only are we being asked apparently to put housing in our job centers, we're actually being asked to put housing where our Least Tern is in a protected area, which I'm not even sure that that is ... I think it's completely impossible as far as I know.

That's why I appreciate some of these speakers in regards to protecting green areas. We have an area that is protected by fish and the feds for our Least Tern. We can't put anything there. Yet when you look at this plan, we're being asked to put, this is an amazing statement to me, 1,425 households planned on the federal nature preserve, home of the endangered Least Tern. That's fascinating to me.

Ken Kirkey: We received a letter from the community development director from Alameda. Staff has been working with Alameda planning staff and have corrected some errors that were found relative to the City of Alameda's allocation of the draft preferred scenario. You'll see some changes when the final preferred scenario is released. That was one of the errors addressed.

Trish Spencer: I greatly appreciate that because we do want to protect the Least Tern. We put a lot of effort in protecting that. I really believe as a state that I'm going to say the majority of Californians have great respect for our bay and wildlife. I think that any plan has to consider these principles. Greenhouse gas reduction. Protecting our green areas. I'm going to say protecting our Least Tern. It has to happen and so when I see something like this it's like okay. It requires a lot of time to review.

I'd actually submit that I think it's unlikely that you're going to be ready for this to have final review when, I think I heard November something. That's a lot of work unless you guys don't sleep at all, which I don't know maybe you don't.

Ken Kirkey: For the most part we don't. You can ask these folks here. They see a lot of me.

Trish Spencer: There's the issue of planning housing on protected green areas that should not be in this plan at all. Figuring out how to have jobs where housing is, it has to happen. People, anyone that's suggesting that jobs continue to be at other places and we just keep putting housing where, we're not going to have a place to, we're an island but these other cities have similar issues, Benicia, you can go through all these letters.

We have to have places for jobs. Otherwise we're exacerbating the problem. When I look at this there's a lot of work to do. I hope that you will consider, take these environmental issues, which actually are very important. The housing jobs imbalance has to be addressed in every community. That's the only way you're going to deal with the problem of transportation.

The problem of transportation is because people have to go from their home far, far away to get to a job. All of that is wasted time. It's unproductive. It's very expensive. To me, the simplest solution is we have an ability to have land, to have jobs where we live, where people live. That principal I do not see being recognized here. It is my opinion it is a critical principle.

Then with this plan there's going to have to be a huge investment in transportation. Which is not going to happen as far as I know. In regards to Prop 13 you can say let's do that but I have to deal with, and I love some of these comments, solving the crisis. To me this is the opposite. We have to plan the best plan ever done. Well this is not anywhere close to it. This is not anything I'd put my name on. There was another one. Which I'm at a loss for.

Oh this is where we're headed. This is not going to be a good plan for our state if this is where we're headed. This is actually the opposite. We need to protect. We have to strive for this greenhouse gas reduction, protect our green areas and deal with this job housing imbalance. Those are the critical principles. That has to happen because we don't have enough money for the infrastructure for transportation. Backwards.

Julie Pierce: Thanks, Trish.

Raul Peralez: Thank you. I'll try to succinct. I apologize again for being late. Last time was a Giants game. This time was a burning RV on 101 that shut it down for two hours. I think I really should take the train.

I think I made my comments several times. My city has put in obviously comments as well. Our mayor in San Jose as well as with the mayor of San Francisco and Oakland to echo the last comments in regards to putting jobs where housing is, having the second most housing in the entire 2010 here, on the plan that I would echo that. We're not talking about one small area obviously within San Jose. We're just talking about San Jose in general. That's obviously the biggest sentiment coming from our city. The need for jobs, and our recognition of it, if we're going to make a difference here.

It hasn't really been brought up, but what are the ramification of not passing this? If a recommendation coming from this body or coming from MTC or if there is so much distaste with what's here, what are those ramifications as we move forward on a timeline?

Ken Kirkey: Well the ramifications are you blow your timeline. This is ultimately a regional transportation plan. It does have a spending investment package of \$309 billion. Any major transportation project in the Bay Area to move forward needs to be in a regional transportation plan.

We already have a pretty tight schedule with an adoption slated for late summer next year. If that slips there will be transportation projects that will be delayed.

I think Steve Heminger, my boss last week when he was at the joint meeting said it well. That this is, it is a limited and focused update. It is not during the RHNA cycle. No one is saying that the draft preferred scenario is perfect, or as I said earlier, that it's the vision the region definitely should be striving for. We're actually trying to say just the opposite.

That given the policies this region has right now, given the lack of policy supports for jobs in certain locations, for affordable housing generally, for market impediments being removed to get more housing built, this is where we're at as a region. With some fairly ambitious policies thrown in to make it at least more focused to achieve the GHG target and so forth.

I think it's important to look at it in that vein, not that this is the end of a discussion or it's the end of the planning process. It is, as President Pierce suggested, a reality check in terms of some of the challenges we face as a region. I would encourage you to keep the process moving forward and to really engage on the policy discussions because it is true. We have a section in the currently adopted plan adopted in 2013 called a plan to build on.

That didn't get that much attention over the last few years. Now there's been a lot going on but some of what was going on should put us in a better position to have those discussions and really address some of the issues that are being raised in these meetings.

- Raul Peralez: Thank you for that. I did bring this up last time in regards to the, just the recognition of sort of where it all comes from and obviously SB 375, reduction of greenhouse gases, leading us to this regional transportation plan that we obviously know has to incorporate housing in the development of transportation around housing. In looking at it and in calling a plan, I think and deciding on how is it going to take us where we want to go versus a snapshot of where we're at.
- I think that that's the report that we have here. I think as we move forward with this, I think obviously the third bullet point here, and that's where I'll transition my comments, because I have no intention on not trying to move this forward. There's a lot at stake, but the reality is that this is not Plan Bay Area. This is Snapshot Bay area. If we want it to turn into Plan Bay Area we can't have ambitious policies assumed in it. We have to have policies required or recommended, necessary, whatever you name it, as you're saying, sort of focusing on the policy of it, that says if we really want to Plan Bay Area, if you're an alcoholic, you don't take a snapshot of how much you drink every day and then say, "I'm going to go get over being an alcoholic by doing the same thing I've been doing." You've set a plan that actually shows you and tells you 12 steps to get there. This is a snapshot. This is the alcoholic continuing to be the alcoholic. If we actually want to plan to not be there, if we want to plan to not have these issues that I know that we're seeing arise in this, then we need to actually make a plan. That's my biggest concern, is that as we move forward, let's actually turn this into Plan Bay Area and not snapshot Bay Area. Thanks.
- Julie Pierce: I think that's the whole purpose of the implementation actions that we need to have those strong policy discussions about. I'm just going to continue on around. Greg, you're next.
- Greg Scharff: Thanks. A couple things. First of all, I actually agree that it would be irresponsible not to pass this. \$309 billion of transportation money, and if we don't think we're going to pass that, that would be frankly irresponsible in my view. That doesn't mean I don't have concerns about this. The reality of the situation is that we should focus on the next plan. We're pretty far along on this, and there's going to be some changes around the edges and stuff, but I don't foresee this is going to change a lot.
- I think the real concern has to be, we have next a next RHNA cycle, how do we make that plan ... As my friend from San Jose said, "How do we make that the real Plan Bay Area?" I think that comes down to ... First of all, I think we need to understand UrbanSim. I actually think UrbanSim is probably right on a macro-level, and has a lot of micro issues, like Trish mentioned. Since she's out of the room, I can say whatever I want. As Trish mentioned, I think we run a risk frankly of when each individual city looks at that, they look at the glitches, and they look at the way UrbanSim says, "If there's vacant land there, you're going to go ahead and build a lot on it," or something.

A lot of those places, communities, would be like, "That's our sacred cow; you're not going to be building there." Communities will then focus and have a rallying cry that, excuse me, "What are those idiots thinking that were going to build on the tern-sacred marsh?" In every community there is a sacred place. I'm sure in Palo Alto we've planned to build on one of our parks or something. What will happen is that you'll create all this opposition for it. I think that's somewhere in UrbanSim we need to understand for the next plan. When people really focus, when their RHNA numbers start coming out.

I am also concerned about what is UrbanSim, and what is transparency? When we did the last RHNA cycle, I remember sitting in the Housing Methodology Committee, there were factors we argued about it. This factor, that factor, different people wanted different factors. There were all sorts of stakeholders in the room, and it was really a bottom-up plan. UrbanSim is a top-down plan. The part I don't understand is ... It doesn't matter what San Jose says about wanting more jobs. That's not going to matter, because UrbanSim spits out ... What I'd want to know if I was San Jose is, "What would move the lever for more jobs in San Jose?" Or, "If we're going to build more housing, what moves the lever in more housing?" I don't know the answers to that.

What I gather with UrbanSim is it doesn't matter what the comments from the public are to some extent, unless it chooses some glitch that you can then fix. What matters is what policies are not accounted for that our city is doing. If we're saying, "Our General Plan says this," and UrbanSim has a completely different number, what are the policies in the General Plan that would affect the UrbanSim? If your policy would be just to approve so much more office space, if UrbanSim for whatever reason, I don't know however it works, doesn't believe the jobs will actually come, then you're not going to get the jobs. I could choose a few communities in the Bay Area: you could say you're going to build tons of housing, but if the market's not there for the housing, you're not going to build the housing.

I think that's where the disconnect with some of the General Plans are. I think UrbanSim is probably on the macro-level correct where we're going for our region. I also think language matters. I think what a lot of people up here are having heartburn of, what I hear, is we keep calling it "the preferred scenario." A lot of people don't prefer it, because they don't like the outcomes they see on the screen. When you look at those outcomes however, they are better than the outcome of doing nothing every time you look at it. It's preferable to doing nothing. I think that's an important point that we need to make.

As we move forward, I think we need more transparency about what actually moves the needle, and what policies would need to be taken. The other thing that interests me is people do Housing Elements, which are the key to Housing. Housing Elements has all sorts of legally ... In fact, when Palo Alto does their Housing Element, HCD is on the phone with, shall we say, the Housing Advocate Stakeholders who are actually on the phone with us, which fascinates me. They complain if we do anything at

all that they think may not increase housing. Yet, still we produce, I believe, less than half of our RHNA numbers, at least in the last cycle.

What are the policies that are causing that to happen on a macro-level, and we're not producing the housing we need to produce? Then, in terms of jobs and the greenhouse gas stuff, I'm thinking to myself, "Yes, put the jobs next to transit. It's the best way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, over putting housing next to the transit." When you look at that, it's clearly true. On the other hand, what you really want to do is put a bunch of housing next to the jobs as well. Just putting jobs somewhere where there's no housing doesn't necessarily help, and only ... what is it in Palo Alto? It could be different in other places, but it's something like, at best, 30% of the people in for-sale housing actually work in the community in which they live.

If we build rental housing next to the jobs, that is much, much higher. I think we need to think about on a more granular level, "How are we actually going to achieve our goals?", and what that means. Let's see ... I'm almost done. I think that we need to think of this as a limited and focused update that the train has really left the station. How do we possibly create a scenario the next time that really works? One other thing I'd say: I think whatever we plan is probably not going to be what actually happens, because you have technological change. All it's going to take is self-driving cars frankly in the next 10 years to up-end our transportation system. To up-end the way we think about these things.

I'm sure that there will be other technological advances in mobility, which seem to be the big thing. I can tell you in our Stanford Research Park, we have six or seven car companies who have moved out of Detroit and are all in Palo Alto trying to figure out how to disrupt mobility and self-driving cars, and all of that. I think that's going to happen, and I know I sound like maybe I'm science fiction-y, but I think it's happening. It'd be interesting to look at the different levers of what would it take to have the Bay Area we want. That's the question that I have no idea what that is, and so it's very hard for me to make that decision. Anyway, thanks.

Ken Kirkey:

I'll just say very quickly, the last piece in particular is a request that has come up again and again. "What would it take to actually achieve these performance metrics?" "What would it take to actually get real jobs housing balance within the various sub-regions of the region?" "If not within every community, at least within every part of the region, how could that happen?" "How would that relate to some of the fiscal imbalances between communities, in some cases, that are right next door to one another?" Because of the housing and jobs dynamic that's played out over the decades, we have huge imbalances in terms of the physical resources they have. That affects how they look at development going forward. It's a lot of the theme. We've heard many things along these lines from various folks through this process.

Julie Pierce:

David.

David Rabbitt: Thank you, I'll be brief. I signed a letter on behalf of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority, and I know you have it; it's in the packet. Again, in the same theme of verifying and validating their UrbanSim numbers. That was on behalf of the unincorporated cities, as well as the county in Sonoma. I think the UrbanSim parcel-by-parcel tool is just very powerful and a great tool, but obviously we need to go back and check for chads, or whatever it is. Making sure that we do have that complete faith in it, because I know that there are some numbers that are amiss. I think Director Mackenzie will probably elaborate further on the city side of that. Great comments, Greg. I was thinking too about the local land use control, of which we always say that is paramount going forward. Of course, General Plans, rarely do you reach build-out. I think something always happens along the way, and a few units here and there. Before you know it, you're probably lucky if you get 80% at the end of a 20 year plan, but something less than that. But at the same time, being a zero sum game and those cities whose general plans, I look at it as a complete package as well and wouldn't it be nice to have this be a tool that would then influence what your general plan's going to do so you know that the growth that is out there that ... Hopefully you have that discussion as your general plans get updated, that you would want to incorporate that or at least have the discussion to figure out what you're going to do about it going forward ... And knowing that the carrot and the stick and the money that's all tied to it will either come or go or you can actually make that decision rationally. However that gets coordinated, that would be a great opportunity and a powerful tool I think for every jurisdiction in the Bay Area to have to see where they fit in within the overall picture of long-term growth in the Bay Area.

Again, just want to make sure that we ... And I'm sure we'll have representatives here on the third to ... However we can do that to verify those numbers and give complete confidence going forward. I think that would make it even more powerful in the long run. Thanks.

Ken Kirkey: Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Thanks Dave. Jake?

Jake Mackenzie: Yep. Off we go. I'm the city rep from Sonoma. You just heard from the county rep and the chair of SCTA. One thing I just mentioned is that these non-jurisdictions in Sonoma County, the planning directors do meet on a regular basis with the planning people in our transportation authority so these are informed comments informed by the cities and the county planning guy, and I'll just tell the rest of you that the staff, and I've check with them, are very pleased with the give and take that's going on now in the interchange since Ken, Miriam and the gang were up in Sonoma County. We appreciate that.

Changes and additional pieces of information needed. Okay, I will always talk about the need for us to look at the yang to the priority of development areas that is ying. Ying, yang. Yang being priority conservation areas. They're always there on the map at the front of the

document. To me it is particularly important that as we concentrate our development and the transportation corridors of the Bay Area, that we are protecting the open spaces and the Ag land because that's a sure way, and we've found this out in Sonoma County through our Ag preservation and open space district, of preserving the urban growth boundaries that each of our cities in Sonoma County have.

Which brings me to my technical point and that is that the two largest cities in Sonoma County, Santa Rosa and Petaluma ... If you wish to read their letters please do. Their comment is that it seems like through UrbanSim that the housing numbers are way in excess of what was anticipated in our first Plan Bay Area where, as I recollect in the four north Bay counties, our standard was 50% of the housing growth to occur within the PDAs. I'm very comfortable with that given that each city has an urban growth boundary in which to contain our growth. That's a point that is made in both of these letters and I think as we move forward needs to be reflected in any final numbers ... which is a curious thing. I'm gathering that there's this expectation that the digestion of all of these changes and their coming out in its final form is going to be presented en masse on November the 17th and that's it.

Julie Pierce: November the 4th, I believe. Isn't that right?

Jake Mackenzie: Are we getting the...

Miriam Chion: The packet will be released on October 31st and there will be a meeting of the joint committee on November 4th.

Jake Mackenzie: No, no. Fine. Remove my comment. Okay. Director Eklund, she and I have talked before. I'll back up her views. If we're going to be talking about resolving the housing problems and growth in the cities of the nine county Bay Areas, we have not resolved the problem of providing resources to actually service our citizens and our new citizens. I've talked ad nauseam as to what happens in Rohnert Park, that we're creating two cities and it's the Mello-Roos Community Development Fund approach so every new citizen who is moving into the houses that are actually being built in the university district of Rohnert Park at this moment are going to be paying a higher level of taxes. They're going to be paying a maintenance annuity fee over \$10,000 in each housing unit to go into a fund. We have to be looking, as someone said at RailVolution last week when they were trying to explain California to all of these people from around the country, the devastating effects of Proposition 13, that we are living with physicalization of land ... You know the stories. No more on that.

The other point is, as new people move into these houses they're all excited because this is the first time in 15 years there's been a new house to move into in Rohnert Park. They're leaving their houses, some of them in Rohnert Park itself. But we are also seeing a swarm of investors coming into Rohnert Park. We happen to have 9,000 up to 9,500 students who are at Sonoma State University. Gosh! Let's build four or five bedroom two-story houses in University District. You better believe there's

going to be a lot of investors. There's going to be fraternity houses, sorority houses. The consequences of the construction of new houses are many and as we move forward I think we have to take that into account.

The last thing that I will say is something I learned at last week's Bay Area Air Quality Management District Climate Leaders Forum and this buttresses what you said about new forms of transportation. This very interesting Doctor Frankie Jones, who is the head of General Motors Advanced Technology Center in the Silicon Valley, started talking about the new values that are driving, if you will, General Motors. They are in a partnership with Lyft. They have a company or an organization known as Maven in different cities around the United States. They're in the business of providing cars to Lyft. They're in the business of looking at autonomous vehicles and so this is very real. When Greg said that there's all of these motor companies moving out into the peninsula, that is for sure. We met one of the last week. It's not just out in the future. It's right now and I think when you wonder what changes in approach for the next planned Bay Area update, technology and transportation, absolutely.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

Ken Kirkey:

I will just mention if I may mention President Pierce very quickly, we do have an MTC a future mobility research study that we're doing with Southern California Association of Government, SCAG, and SANDAG, and it's looking at this very issue of the full breadth of transportation changes that are coming at us pretty quickly and also looking at what would be some of the land use implications of these changes and how do they vary among regions. I don't think there will be anything that will change course for the plan in terms of growth or specific projects, but there will be a look see for this is something that is coming at us and something to actually build on as we move towards the next plan.

Jake Mackenzie:

That resonated with me very much, so thank you, Madame Chair.

Julie Pierce:

Thank you Jake. Karen?

Karen Mitchoff:

Thank you.

I'm going to say something else, but first I want to comment on Greg. Do we have to call this a final preferred scenario? I think we need to use different language. It's been confusing to us and we're supposed to know what we're talking about. The public is going to glom onto that. We need to come up with a different characterization. I don't care what you call it, just don't call it a final preferred scenario. That would be that.

I really don't have answers to these questions. I wasn't going to speak until I heard from the Mayor of Alameda. And I want to bring everybody up to speed with what was discussed at the Regional Planning Committee two weeks ago. We're talking about our planned PDAs. We're talking about PCAs. Miriam mentioned the planned production areas. There is a movement by our housing advocates to make housing the number one priority and I agree. Instead of houses and jobs, we in Contra Costa County are talking about jobs near housing. We have the housing,

but the whole argument conversation at the meeting two weeks ago was, nothing is more important than building houses. We have to have houses as the highest priority ... And that again goes to words, priority development, priority conservation. That's what they're called. It's because it's a priority to build or do something in that area, not that it's a priority of a whole list of priorities. They sort of usurp that, and I want you to be aware of that.

I made a motion to keep everything equal, neutral if you will, because of local control, and was voted down, mostly by the housing advocates. It's very frustrating. They don't sit on this body, which is a good thing, because we are the policy makers and I think it's important to have that input, but you need to be aware, as this moves forward, maybe not in this whatever we're going to call it, snapshot, but as we develop Plan Bay Area 2040, when the RHNA numbers come out, they are going to make a real strong pitch for that.

At least in Contra Costa County, we've got enough houses. We may not have enough affordable houses, but we've got enough houses. We need jobs, and that's why we're pushing or Northern Waterfront Initiative, which will come under this proposed priority production area, because it addresses the GHG. We've got an area where we want to build clean jobs, and people won't have to. Plus, I represent the area that is the Concord Naval Weapons Station, which is going to be the largest development in the Bay Area over the next 40 years. The idea is to have jobs there, even though housing will come, it's near a transit place, but I just want you all to be aware of this. I do not believe that one should have priority over the other.

We are the people that need to make the decisions at our local level, and it really was not only frustrating, but really disrespectful from my perspective, that they felt, this was the BIA, this was the Bay Area Council, these are all people we work with, we like them, they're great people, I go back and forth with Matt Reagan, he's one of my constituents, we all agree to disagree, we all agree that we respect each other, but in the end Matt, you are wrong. I'm sorry. You are wrong. Because we need jobs and housing, but yet they seem to feel the other way around. Please be aware of that as we move forward in this discussion, that there is going to be advocacy, and we are going, if you agree with me, are going to have to push back that these are all three important things, and in your community, maybe one thing, and in your community, it's another, but please, whatever advocacy group you're with, do not tell us which one is the higher priority. It may be a higher priority to you, and we understand that, but it's not when it comes to policies. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Thanks Karen. Mark. Let me guess what you're going to talk about.

Mark Luce: You don't know this time. I'll just incorporate my comments on work proximity housing and the idea of having a workforce zone where you could actually zone a project to be workforce, so that you don't have to

have those external factors of investors and retirees compete for that housing. Which brings me to really my question, it's more philosophical. I guess what I'd like to see is what is any of these plans look like at build out? You've got basically, what, eight billion people in the world? About seven billion of them would like to live in the Bay Area. They're not going to, but they'd like to. You'll always have those constant pressures of these external forces, and what brings them here are our job qualities, whatever those might be, our great ports, our great universities, our great synergies, our lifestyle, and the more we improve in this Bay Area, the more attractive it's going to be.

Our poor transportation system seems to keep a few of them out, but not many, and affordability is keeping a few of them out, but not many. Those four values always play together. I don't think you can have great lifestyle and great economic opportunities and expect affordability and great transportation all in the same place, because then those other six billion people are going to start moving into that community.

The question that I'd like to have, and I think each community has got a little different set of values, if you will, of each of those values, different economic values, different affordability values, and therefore each community is somewhat unique in terms of its ultimate build out.

What would be valuable from a modeling perspective is what I'd call the infinite state, the build out, given what we know today, the constraints that we know today, not Lyft or Uber or whatever changing something, but given what we know today, what does build out look like? What's the ultimate population, how much pain are we willing to endure in transportation? Are we going to have six hour commutes in driverless cars, because we can? Why not? Or what? Actually, don't skip that. Assuming we have driverless cars, we'll worry about that when it comes. What does that look like? What does build out look like, and is that what we want?

Ultimately, is that ... What I see happening is, we keep doing one thing, which then means we've got to do another thing, which means we've got to do another thing, and you just keep going around in circles, and you're never really answering the final question, is where are you going? What is ultimate build out? Is there a Bay Area where we're built out? Where our urban limits are where they want to be, where our transportation limits are where they ought to be, where our lifestyle is where we want it to be, and we're just built out. If so, where is that, when is it, and I think that's really important for us to understand.

Ken Kirkey:

I guess first I'd say it's probably something the region would argue about, what the answer is to that question. But I think variations of what you're putting forward is what we're hearing over and over again, which is too ... First of all, I think there's a general understanding that not just at the regional level in terms of MTC and ABAG, but the Bay Area, this place, has for 30 years or so had more or less an infill approach to growth, or tried to, but it's made infill really hard to do. We haven't built enough

housing. We don't really know what the answer is in terms of how much housing we can accommodate through infill, because we haven't really done it. We haven't done it since we adopted Plan Bay Area in 2013, anywhere near the level that the plan suggests we're supposed to be.

As I said before, there are requests to look at. What would it take to achieve the performance metrics that are actually adopted by the executive board and the commission? What would it take? If we weren't looking at the control total that was adopted. What does that look like?

I think about it in part in terms of the plan, in terms of transportation and land use, how we deal with each is of course quite different. Some of that is understandable, but to some degree ... The way we deal with the transportation side of the plan is very defined. We say, "Here's how much money we can project. Here's how much we believe we will have." We fiscally constrain it, we look at the projects that are submitted, we run them through the wringer, and we prioritize them, and we say, "How much funding is needed to make this happen?" Then we have a strategy to try to close the gap. It's far from perfect, but it is much more refined and much more detailed than what we have done relative to land use and housing. Maybe we need to do something in the future that is more along those lines, so we can understand what it is we're actually trying to get to, and what it would take to get there beyond what we have.

Mark Luce:

I guess it's a theoretical limit, and so it would assume ... Have some basic assumption, like funding is not a problem. The only issue is, how wide can you make the highways, or how wide are you willing to make the highways? Housing is not a problem. It's just how tall do you want to build it, and transportation, how congestion are you willing to accept? What kind of compromises on lifestyle are you willing to accept?

I guess the infinite model of where does this all go if all the constraints are removed, and then it leads to the next question, which is ... And if we don't like that, what policies do we need to make it different than what it would be? I think that's kind of what we're getting at. I don't think we can ... I think with the tools we have today, we're not going to end up where we want to be. I think we need new tools, like what we talked about, to make a difference, and to have something where we've got a little better balance, where transportation isn't a two hour commute every day, just because it's more affordable.

I think no matter how wide we make those highways, there will still be two hour commutes. If there's not something from a policy perspective that's going to change that.

Miriam Chion:

Just to add to what Mark, what a great question. I think if we were to apply your question to 20 years ago, people would probably say, "We are built out. There's nothing, there's no one single person that we can add." But then your other central point, the quality of life, and what our expectations, I think that that's what keeps planning such a dynamic dimension. It's not a plan, it's a planning process, and so before we were not willing to drive more than an hour, now we drive two or three. Before,

as Greg and I were discussing, it was not acceptable to have a roommate if you were a professional. It was not acceptable to live with your parents if you went to a grad school or to a university. Now it's more and more of a pattern. There are all kinds of changes, and maybe some of those are positive. Greg loves to live with his daughter, so it's a great thing. It's a great change in social behavior, in culture, in lifestyle. There are other elements such as the commute or the congestion that we might want to avoid. I think you're raising a very good question. What's the quality of life and what are the adjustments that we want to accommodate and what are the elements that we want to remove? We're hoping that with your input we're able to give you some framework so it's not just this issue of what we want, but we need to work harder and how hard we need to work and what areas we need to work so we can get to where we want or we are able to deliver a Bay Area to our kids or grandkids that is desirable.

Julie Pierce: Thank you Mark, Candace.

Candace Andersen: Yes.

Julie Pierce: And then we'll go to Jim, and then we're going to go to Dave, and then to David and then I'm going to wrap it up and then we will get out of here before 10.

Candace Andersen: Okay and I'm going to go really quick. Karen said a lot of what I wanted to say which was with regard to me, the critical importance of priority production areas. This goes back to each community needing to identify what is the housing/jobs balance they want to see to maintain the quality of life in their own community. In Contra Costa, we have 19 cities, but we do have a plan in place to create more jobs where we've already have housing. Yes, we can always use more housing and we have plans for that but we need to provide some incentives for those areas where there is housing to create those jobs.

We, Julie, Karen and I, are working right now on a transportation half-cent sales tax, and it's a very multi-faceted approach to this, but we have a serious imbalance in where our jobs are versus our housing. Our southbound commute on 680 can take someone an hour and half to two hours to get from one end of the county to the other. The reverse commute is true, as well, showing there is that imbalance. We're continuing to create jobs in Dave's backyard, in San Ramon. With our transit, with our transportation sales tax, we're not just saying we're going to keep building bigger roads, you know, we're testing autonomous vehicles in the Concord Naval Weapons Station right now. We are incorporating into that plan technology.

But again to me, unless we provide that incentive to let the cities, let the counties say, this is where we really need to focus the resources we need, it creates a plan that is not helpful. All of us want, to me, the ultimate goal of Plan Bay Area is to improve the quality of life for the entire Bay Area, without infringing upon open space. I was shocked to hear in Alameda that they're suggesting that you build in protected wetlands or whatever they're saying, you know, and I realize that's an

error. But nevertheless, none of us want to see that in any of our communities. We do want to see a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, we do want to see a reduction in the time our communities, members of our community are spending in their vehicles, so give us the tools that we can utilize to really find that optimal balance and not just have it be modeling, but having it be presented through grants et cetera that we can see these things happen.

Miriam Chion: Just quickly on the priority production areas, we've been working for two years through the Regional Planning Committee in coordination with MTC and Goods Movement on this concept. This is really based on a lot of the groundwork in the Northern Waterfront, in Hayward, and different parts of the East Bay and the North Bay. We feel there is a lot of mature work to be able to include the concept in this plan. It will take some time to get the designation and implementation at a local level, but it seems that there's enough support, substantial knowledge to get that as a component of this plan conceptually.

Candace Andersen: Thank you and I think even if it's just aspirational, if it's being significantly acknowledged that this is the direction we are going, I think that would be very helpful.

Julie Pierce: Alright, Jim.

Jim Davis: Thank you, I got a few questions, hopefully some clarifying questions. If we don't meet the projected date for the adoption of the update to the Plan Bay Area, what happens?

Ken Kirkey: If it isn't adopted next summer, the time period I referred to, it means we have a, the technical phrasing is, it means we have a lapse in conformity which means the Federal Highways Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, can hold up money coming to the region for various projects.

We have a grace period, but the grace period can only go a month or so.

Jim Davis: So what we need is we need an update to the original Plan Bay Area with some numbers into it so that other planning agencies see that we're trying to forecast what our future is going to look like, is that correct?

Ken Kirkey: Not exactly, California is a unique and special place, as we all know. The regional transportation plan requirement is a federal requirement. MTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the federal MPO, the federal transportation agency is responsible for updating that every four years. It is on time-certain basis and its statutory and projects have to be in the plan to move forward, move forward on a regular basis.

With SB 375, that said that every RTP, every cycle, would have a sustainable community strategy of forecasted growth pattern which together with the RTP would result in greenhouse gas reduction so we have a target to meet. The forecast component, the SB 375 component is a State requirement, but state law wraps it all into one, so we do still have to do that, we can't leave it aside. But the federal government is kind of, I

think if you ask them they think SB 375 is a good idea, but statutorily, they're agnostic about that piece of it. We by law in California though have to adopt it as one, they can't be adopted separately.

Speaker: It's just on a different schedule, it's every two years that we happen to do something.

Ken Kirkey: It's created a dynamic for our regional transportation plan to adjust funding and so forth, it was complicated but it arguably made a bit more sense. I think one of the challenges that planners find themselves in, as you all know at a city level, you don't update your general plans every four years. The idea of updating a regional land use plan every four years, change only happens so quickly. I think that's in part why looking at the statutory requirements we have tried to say, as Miriam said earlier, that this is a limited and focused update. It doesn't include RHNA, there is no requirement on local jurisdictions to take these numbers and do something with them. It won't be used for the next RHNA but it is a look at where we are at in terms of our development in the region and some of the policy implementation that we should do to hopefully try to move forward and make more progress on some of the issues that have been discussed.

Jim Davis: Let's take for instance, the draft proposal that we've been looking at. Let's say that everybody here in the room was just super happy with it and we figured all the numbers were pretty good and we adopt it. We say, okay this is it. Would that meet all the statutory requirements of all the different governmental agencies so that the money that would be out there for programs and projects would be able to go forward?

Ken Kirkey: If it's adopted as the entire plan, as the investment strategy and growth allocation, yes.

Jim Davis: Okay, let me ask you another question on this UrbanSim, is that or is it not an algorithm? Data in produces data out.

Ken Kirkey: It is.

Jim Davis: Okay, so what we're trying to do I guess here, is to get the very best data that we can to put into that so that we get some sort of prognosis of what's going to happen in the future. Is that what we're trying to do? So if we put bad numbers in, then it produces bad numbers out but we still have a report that everybody becomes happy with and we adopt and we meet all the standards that are imposed upon us by law and regulation, then we've accomplished our goal. Would that be true?

Ken Kirkey: Conceivably, but I, we have made this a pretty transparent process so when people look at where growth is assumed, which they can do. That information was provided to most of the planning staff in the region, they can see when there are errors, and we can see when there are errors and we're asking jurisdictions, and staff, and others looking on to identify when things are not correct so that they can be corrected.

Jim Davis: Here's my thought, I've got 15 cities in San Clara County, six of those cities have sent in letters discussing the numbers that we have proposed. All six of the cities, to one varying degree or another, said that the numbers are wrong. That's not even taking into consideration cities like, Saratoga and Los Altos Hills, which have thrown up their arms long ago and given up on this whole Plan Bay Area business. I think in consideration, Milpitas, which is a major junction spot in San Clara County, not taking into consideration Santa Clara, who basically doesn't participate. It doesn't take into consideration Campbell which has a very volatile planning process. It doesn't take into consideration the fact that my city is currently updating our land use and transportation element. Our land use and transportation element update is not going to match the calendar for which we have to have this Plan Bay Area update put in place. My numbers, or the numbers that you take from me, or the numbers that you find about my city, are going to be wrong. I've got several other cities that I've just discussed that aren't participating because they don't feel that they're finding a benefit from it. Are we going through a series of steps just in frustration, or are we actually accomplishing something?

Ken Kirkey: I think we're trying to move toward making the plan, among other things, not just a regional transportation plan, but a growth allocation plan that is useful for the region. A lot of the tough questions that are coming up relative to the scenario are about that. It is important that we get a lot of input from the jurisdictions. This plan is updated every four years. For example, if your city is updating its general plan, and that's the nature of time horizons and we don't capture the most recent update because it occurs in later 2017, it will be captured relatively soon because this plan does get updated every four years. It can be incorporated in the future.

Jim Davis: It's bad data. You've taken bad data and put it into an algorithm who is producing bad data on the output end. That's what I'm trying to get at.

Ken Kirkey: It's not perfect data.

Jim Davis: The thing is, that you quite honestly. I have much more faith in the statistics that the Joint Venture Silicon Value Leadership Group produced for me, than the information that is being produced by Plan Bay Area. Thank you.

Julie Pierce: Thank you, Jim. Dave Hudson.

Dave Hudson.: Yeah. Most of what I was going to say has been stolen somewhere during the night.

Julie Pierce: Good.

Hudson: I want to go back to basics because I think Ken's been telling us stuff, and for whatever reason we decide to tell him, "No, no, no." SB 375 calls for a sustainable community strategy. We've done this once. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. Came out in 2008 with a scoping plan, that scoping plan said that this sustainable community strategy is responsible for, curing might be the wrong word, 32% of our ills with greenhouse gas.

Transportation is a whole 38%. It's was mandated by AB 32. We're not going to get away from doing this. We might not do it, but somebody else is going to do it, and we're not going to like it.

What I'd ask is, I've heard a lot of no, we can't do this, everything's wrong. Look at the first bullet. Are there changes, or additional pieces of information needed to approve the final preferred scenario? If you want to change it to scenario preferred, or something else so that it's not the same name, so be it. We've been using already, preferred scenario. If it's bad, and this is the time to change words, we change words. These three bullets, we should be taking back to our cities, say, "Hey, we don't have to reinvent the wheel." "We've got to make this as good as we can." "We're looking long-term strategy four years down the road for the one that all of our planning departments hate, those RHNA numbers."

If you've got something that needs to be changed, I heard tonight from a couple people they have to be. Get them the information, let's see what the changes are the next time we meet, and be ready to move on it.

Julie Pierce:

Dave Rabbitt.

Dave Rabbitt

Just a thought.

Julie Pierce:

I'm really not going to go around twice here.

Dave Rabbitt

I appreciate that. Ken, you mention the analytical approach to transportation decisions and said that we don't do the same with housing, but I go back to the general plans and say that yeah we do actually. We don't do it on a regional level, but we do it on a local level. I think that, obviously we need to flip that, and it goes back even with the numbers of trying to coordinate those general plans. I do think the general plan can be a very powerful document. It's the land use constitution of every jurisdiction; it now has so many elements in it that you can factor in quality of life issues, and everything else. To really take that document, and build it into our regional plan. At least you would know the capacity, or at least you'd know the capacity of what all the individual jurisdictions think their capacities may be.

That's where I think then you have to go back and kind of maybe knock some places upside the head and say, "You may think this is what you're ultimate capacity is, but within the entire region we need to accommodate more and this is a reasonable ..." Somehow to coordinate those two, I think really needs to happen because there is a lot of thought given to those land use pieces. Just to kind of pull that in somehow, some way. Then you'd have a document that I think was really coordinated, and would have some buy in. Again, local control would be adhered to. I think local control but with a little, what the word is, but kind of bringing a little reality into the more regional issues of where you're at.

I appreciate that, but I just wanted to mention that again.

Julie Pierce:

Thank you. Jake, your card never went down after your first time so I'm assuming you're done. Okay, good. I just wanted to summarize a couple

of things that were brought up last Friday because I think there were some good things for us to think about. I'm not asking for a discussion on any of these, I just want to throw them out for some fuel for thought as we continue to go forward.

One of the things that Chari Spring talked about was, "What would it take to get us back in balance?" The affordability challenges are real and that our discussion going forward needs to be really bold, aggressive, and have an integrated solution.

Mr. Heminger mentioned, might require the state taking some kind of action to help us out. It may take the state giving us the ability to take actions. He noted that on this election coming up in just over two weeks, that we have \$19 billion of transportation money on local ballots around the Bay Area, and over a billion dollars of housing money. While that's a lot of money, it's probably going to take a billion dollars of housing money per year. Not a one shot, but per year, to actually affect the kinds of numbers that we're talking about.

Scott Weiner mentioned housing numbers are really grim. How many housing units do we really need to diffuse the crisis that we have now, to stop what he called the 'train-wreck' that we're facing? More like a million or more to get to a meaningful outcome. We have 820 thousand in this plan. Does that just keep us status quo, or does that actually improve things? What do we need to do?

Dave Campos mentioned that we have a regional transportation plan, and a regional transportation agency, but we don't have a regional housing agency. Maybe that's something that ABAG, MTC, everything can become more of without taking away local control that we do a better job of regional housing planning. He called it a regional housing marshal plan. That we might need to change some of our standards, we'd need an implementation plan, and would a billion dollars a year for 25 years, what would that mean to housing? I think that tackles what Mark was talking about as well. What does it take to get somewhere, and then what does it look like if we try to do that? If we could even accomplish that.

Amy Worth mentioned that there's a huge disconnect between the large employers between who are producing jobs in one side of the Bay, and their lack of support for the transportation and housing needs of their employees, who many of them have to travel from literally one side of the Bay Area to the other every day for jobs. I was just sharing with Greg that Candace mentioned the disconnect we have in Contra Costa, eastern side of our county in Brentwood, and Antioch, and Pittsburg, and Oakley. Many of those folks travel to Silicon Valley every single day, and that is a brutal commute. It really tears families apart because there is no family time.

Yet, we have a devil of a time trying to get jobs to come out to where the people live in affordable housing, and that part of the Bay Area is having a hard time building the housing needed for the jobs that they already have. I commend those cities who are trying really hard to do more, but I

think one of the things even that Greg said on Friday was it's really hard to get housing and jobs in his town. There is a certain amount of push-back that we all get when we have those planning meetings. We've all been in front of those naysayers who say, "I've got mine, and nobody else gets to come." Even when you tell them, "Well, this is your kids and grandkids that we're trying to accommodate." Some of them tell you, and I've been told this more than once by elected officials, "That's too bad, they can go find another state to live in because we're not going to change where we're going." I think that's really short-sided personally, but we've all heard it.

I think one of the things I want to leave you with is that we're all sensing the frustration here. We all deal with it every day, and what we need going forward is to frame a discussion that transcends just government. It has to include business, it has to include all of our stakeholders, to see how we can work collaboratively to solve these housing and transportation problems.

As Jim Spering and I, as chairs of the two committees, and the joint committee, were talking about it after the meeting, we think very strongly that we need to start immediately after the first of the year to put together some workshop type forums. That kind of a format, smaller groups, to bring the discussion forward, where we incorporate businesses, and stakeholders, and maybe around more concise topics, and issues to try to do some brainstorming and get this to be more of a collaborative issue.

We all know we can write the greatest plans but if we don't have the participation of the rest of the community, it ain't going to happen. If we're going to improve the quality of living for our kids and grandkids, and theirs as well, we've got to get on it now and figure out how to do things a little differently. We've got to figure out what are those policy levers that we've got to push, and how are we going to get that to be accepted by our constituencies.

In some areas of the Bay Area, particularly in Alameda County, there are threats to recall people for trying to put in the housing and the jobs that are needed. They're trying to comply with the plan, they're working hard. The public is doing what we see every day at our councils and our boards, and that's, "I've got mine, nobody else gets theirs." We've got to find a way to educate our community that that is no longer acceptable. The economy of our Bay Area depends on it.

Just some food for thought. We've got a long ways to go. I think it's the time to start those policy discussions. As soon as we get this sent off to an EIR, and we may be able to incorporate some of the ideas into the implementation actions for this plan to build toward what we want to incorporate in the more aspirational plan. This reality check points out where the flaws are, and what we need to do to try to fix it. I think that gives us something to build on. I don't think all is lost. I do still have problems with it being called a preferred plan. Maybe it's just an interim plan, I don't know. Maybe it's a reality check. Anyway, we need to figure

that out. With that, unless there are any other urgent comments ... I will say we are adjourned. Thank you all for coming, thanks for the good discussion.

[End Transcript Executive Board Meeting 10/20/16 on Plan Bay Area]

10. ADJOURNMENT

The ABAG staff presentation concluded at about 9:56 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Executive Board will be on November 17, 2016.

Submitted:

/s/ Brad Paul, Acting Secretary-Treasurer

Date Submitted: December 7, 2016

Approved: December 15, 2016

For information or to review audio recordings of ABAG Executive Board meetings, contact Fred Castro, Clerk of the Board, at (415) 820 7913 or FredC@abag.ca.gov.